

Law Offices
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP
Suite 1000
1725 K Street
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930
Facsimile (202) 887-0357
Facsimile (202) 331-7519

DATE: August 16, 2004

TO: Examiner John Sheehan

Phone No.: (571) 272-1249

RE: **Page 6 of Amendment filed August 9, 2004**
U.S. Patent Application, S.N. 09/924,476
By: **KIKUGAWA, Atsushi et al.**
Our Reference: P3271-5776-A-010983

FROM: William L. Brooks *wlw*

NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET): 2

FACSIMILE TELEPHONE NUMBER: (571) 273-1249

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE SAFE AND CLEAR RECEIPT OF ALL PAGES BEING SENT

Per your request, attached please find a copy of page 6 of the Amendment which was filed on August 9, 2004. Please excuse any inconvenience this may have caused.

/alw

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS MESSAGE IS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED. This message may also be an attorney/client communication which is privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by calling us collect and return the original message to us at the above address by mail. Thank you.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/924,476
Response to Office Action dated May 28, 2004

what is claimed in order to satisfy the written description requirement. Lack of literal basis in the disclosure for the limitation that a claimed decomposition step "be conducted in the absence of a catalyst" does not establish a *prima facie* case for lack of descriptive support, and it cannot be held that the originally-filed disclosure would not have conveyed the concept of effecting decomposition at elevated temperatures in the absence of a catalyst.

In the instant case, the specification discloses that the chemical conversion film, which does not contain aluminum as a possible choice for the constituent component (a) in claim 1, is provided directly on the surface of the magnet. Thus, it would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that no aluminum film could be provided between the surface of the magnet and the chemical conversion film.

Thus, the 35 USC §102(b) rejection and the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should both be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-6, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.